



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

H/A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,966	10/14/2003	Emmanuel Huber	60,130-1914;02MRA0232	9951
26096	7590	09/05/2006	EXAMINER	
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C. 400 WEST MAPLE ROAD SUITE 350 BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009			RUTLAND WALLIS, MICHAEL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/684,966

Applicant(s)

HUBER ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Rutland-Wallis

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/14/2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 October 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/14/2003.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of group I claims 1-19 in the reply filed on 06/05/2006 is acknowledged.

Claim Objections

Claim 15 recites the limitation " the first and second peripheral devices " There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the lock assembly and the control module being disposed in a disposed in wet and dry zones as described in claim 19 must be shown or the feature canceled from the claim. No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure

Art Unit: 2835

is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency.

Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granitz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,990,573) in view of Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,744,147)

With respect to claims 1-2, and 13 Granitz teaches an electrical architecture for a vehicle (item 8) door, comprising: a lock assembly (door lock solenoid see figure 3 item

Art Unit: 2835

DSF for example i.e. a first peripheral device) a control module (door lock control switch see figure 3 item DSR i.e. a second peripheral device); a door controller (item 18 PWR Door locks-DSF i.e. a third peripheral device); and a single wiring (see wires extending from item 18 to DSF and DSR) connection connecting the lock assembly and a control module devices to the door controller. Granitz does not discuss the connection as a wiring harness. Taniguchi teaches a vehicle wiring harness and communication system similar to the device of Granitz wherein the device of Taniguchi additionally discloses a typical wiring harness connection seen in figure 2. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize wiring harness connection such as that of Taniguchi in order to connect the control modules and the feature modules or locks.

With respect to claim 3 and 15 Granitz teaches the first and second peripheral devices are integrally connected together to form an integral unit seen in figure 1 & 3. Note that the, peripheral devices are mounted on the door, and integrally interconnected by said door.

With respect to claims 4, 10 and 17 Granitz does not discuss the molding or the type of the connection ends of the wiring connection or whether molded connections ends are present. Taniguchi teaches the wiring harness has a housing shown in exemplary embodiment as a rectangular housing, which are commonly made of molded plastic, see figure 2 items SH1 and SH2. While neither Granitz nor Taniguchi teach the connection is a molded connection, such a connection end is well known in connector ends and would have been obvious to use molded ends in order to construct the

Art Unit: 2835

harness from modular components, if in fact such a connector is not already utilized by Taniguchi

With respect to claims 5, 6 and 16 Granitz teaches the integrally connected first and second peripheral devices are connected, however, is silent in describing the connection as breakable or separable. It is inherent that any electrical connection may be broken or separated under certain electrical or mechanical strain.

With respect to claim 7 Granitz and Taniguchi are silent on the use of a perforated section. The connectors of at least Taniguchi are plug type connectors shown in figure 2. The connector ends contain holes or perforations to receive pins from a male connector; therefore the breakable connection is perforated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a perforated wire or connector in order to expedite the disconnection from the harness.

With respect to claim 8 Granitz as modified by Taniguchi teach the breakable connection is at least one connecting tab (fig 2 and 3. of Taniguchi)

With respect to claim 9 Granitz does not discuss the molding or the type of the connection ends of the wiring connection or whether molded connections ends are present. Taniguchi teaches the wiring harness has a housing shown in exemplary embodiment as a rectangular housing, which are commonly made of molded plastic, see figure 2 items SH1 and SH2. While neither Granitz nor Taniguchi teach the connection is a molded connection, such a connection end is well known in connector ends and would have been obvious to use molded ends in order to construct the harness from modular components, if in fact such a connector is not already utilized by

Art Unit: 2835

Taniguchi. Granitz further teaches the wiring harness comprises a plurality of wires (see figure 3) that are separable from each other.

With respect to claim 11 Taniguchi teaches a connector socket (see figure 2 and 3 module connector sockets) that accommodates the wiring harness and that is disposed on at least one of the first and second peripheral devices.

With respect to claims 12 and 18 Granitz teaches the wiring connection comprises a plurality of wires (see figure 3) that are separable from each other.

With respect to claim 14 Granitz teaches the lock subassembly and the control module are disposed in different locations (figure 2) in the vehicle door.

Claim 19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Granitz et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,990,573) in view of Taniguchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,744,147) as applied to claim 13 above, and further in view of Yutaka Noro (EP 0 534 659 A) Granitz is silent on the placement of the lock or the control module in either a wet or a dry zone, locks and locking solenoids are typically found in the prior art proximate the door handle on the exterior of the vehicle door, Granitz teaches the connection to mirrors, locks and windows and other feature modules which are located in the exterior or wet side of the vehicle door. One of ordinary skill in the art may reasonably understand the control system of Granitz then to be found in the interior or dry zone of the door. Noro teaches a vehicle wiring harness wherein a control module (6) resides in the interior or dry zone and connectors to connect the mirror module are connected on the frame side or wet side seen in (figure 1 and 4). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to connect the lock assembly to the wet side and the

Art Unit: 2835

control module to the dry side in order to protect the control module from water damage and to reduce cost by placing the lock assembly near the door handle.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Rutland-Wallis whose telephone number is 571-272-5921. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 7:30AM-6:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lynn D. Feild can be reached on 571-272-2092. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MRW

 **ANATOLY VORTMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**